REMARKS

I.   Overview

These remarks are set forth in response to the New Non-Final Office Action.

Presently, claims 1 through 8 and 10 through 14 are pending in the Patent Application.

Claims 1 and 8 are independent in nature. In the New Non-Final Office Action, each of

claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatenable

over United States Patent No. 6,563,955 to de Quieroz in view of U.S. Patent Application

Publication No. 2003/0093568 by Deshpande. Further, claims 1 through 4, 8 and 10

through 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent

Application Publication No. 2003/0007703 by Roylance in view of Deshpande. Yet

further, claims 6 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over de Quieroz and Deshpande and further in view of of U.S. Patent No.

6,055,017 to Shen et al. (Shen), and also over Roylance in view of Shen. Finally, claims

5 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Roylance and Deshpande in view of Jong Whan Jang et al., Performance Evaluation of

Scene Change Detection Algorithms (Jang) and also de Queiroz and Deshpande in view

of Jang. In response, **Applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 consistently with the**

teachings of a shared application set forth in paragraph [0003] of Applicants'

originally filed Specification.

II.   The Applicant's Invention

The Applicants have invented a system, method and apparatus for the

componentized configuration of a shared application server based upon varying shared

application types. In accordance with the present invention, a shared application server

can be configured to interoperate with pluggable image processing logic based upon the

requirements of a shared application hosted in the shared application server. Where the

hosted shared application requires high fidelity imaging, pluggable image processing

logic can be selected to achieve lossless image capturing and compression. By

comparison, where the shared application requires high transmission speeds regardless of

image fidelity, image processing logic can be selected to achieve high image compression

ratios and small image packaging sizes. In this way, the characteristics of the shared

application can be considered in configuring the shared application server.

III.   Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 103(a)

A.   Characterization of Deshpande

Despande is directed to a remote desktop communication protocol that includes

spatial and temporal compression techniques. In Deshpande, multimedia presentation

data is generated at a server from a source. A compression facility modifies the

presentation data by both spatially and temporally compressing the presentation data to

transmittable data. In some embodiments, a check is performed to ensure that the least

amount of data is selected prior to sending the transmittable data to a remote client. The

remote client receives the transmittable data and re-constructs the original multimedia

presentation data. In some embodiments that use lossy compression, the reconstruction

may not exactly re-construct the original multimedia presentation data. Once re-created,

the remote client presents the presentation data at the remote client. The presentation

data could be audio, video, or other data or a combination of them.

B.   Argument

Deshpande clearly pertains to distribution of video from a server to viewer clients.

Paragraph [0036] of Deshpande provides:

> [0036] Once the video clip is available to the server 30 , a video display program, or
> other suitable process runs on the server. For example, the server 30 may run a standard
> or streaming video player, flash program, or other application that converts the desired
> data into a series of images to make frames of a video. Instead of displaying the image on
> the display 32 of the server 30 , however, the server codes the display data and sends it
> over the communication pipeline 24 with commands to show it on the display 22 of the
> thin client 10 . The display 32 of the server 30 may show an indication that a process is
> running, and the video that is shown on the display 22 of the thin client 10 may in fact
> also be shown on the display 32 of the server. But the central focus of the system is to
> show the desired video on the display 22 of the thin client 10 .

A shared application as understood by the skilled artisan is not merely a remote video
session but the shared viewing of a common application remotely including user interface
interactions such as mouse pointer movements. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 8
consistently with paragraph [0003] of Applicants' originally filed Specification to provide
for the transmission not only of image frames of the shared application, but also mouse
pointer movements of the shared application. Deshpande, of course, lacks such a
teaching since Deshpande pertains to the distribution of a video clip that is not interactive
as would be the case with a shared application.

IV.   Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35
U.S.C. § 103(a) owing to the amended and cancelled claims and the foregoing remarks.
The Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed

on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 21, 2010   /Steven M. Greenberg/

Steven M. Greenberg, Reg. No.: 44,725
Carey, Rodriguez, Greenberg & Paul, LLP
Customer No. 46321